

REMARKS

In light of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

At paragraph 1 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the title of the invention as not being clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Applicants have requested that the title be amended to read "IMAGING APPARATUS FOR PERFORMING SELECTIVE PROCESSING OF IMAGE DATA". Applicants therefore respectfully request that the objection to the title be withdrawn.

At paragraph 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings, requesting a "Prior Art" legend be added to Fig. 1. Applicants have requested this amendment to the drawings in the accompanying Request for Approval of Drawing Changes, and therefore request that the objection to the drawings on this ground be withdrawn.

At paragraph 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the disclosure in that page 4, line 6 includes a line as a typographical error. Applicants have requested removal of this paragraph.

At paragraph 5 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 5,751,350). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to specifically recite decimation processing to decimate the image data that is output from the imaging section, in conjunction with CCD/F 21A (page 28, line 17 and Figs. 4 and 16) in real time. This decimation process is performed only in the first, finder operation mode. This decimation process is performed before

the input to camera DSP 21C that performs YCrCb conversion and resolution conversion which are also real time signal processing performed in accordance with the first processing mode. According to the decimation process performed at the imaging device (CCD) and CCD interface, the image data can be reduced so as to assure that real time processing following image capturing can be performed.

Applicants submit that this decimation feature is not included in the still camera as disclosed by Tanaka. At page 3, line 22 of Tanaka, the Examiner has stated that Tanaka's camera includes a real time processing for decimating the image "since the image is used as a current taking image to a user". While it appears that the Examiner is relying on a portion of Tanaka indicating that an image data must be decimated in order to be displayed for the user in a view finder, there is no clear statement in Tanaka that the decimation is in fact performed, or when the decimation is to be performed. There are many ways to reduce the size of image data to be displayed on a display device, and indeed, it may not be necessary to reduce the image data at all if the resolutions of the CCD and display are comparable. Tanaka does not discuss these points at all. Even if in the case that the image data must be reduced in order to be displayed, it is still not apparent from Tanaka when and how the image data is reduced. Rather than only performing decimation processing, a resolution conversion process, or other procedure for data reduction may be employed.

The claimed decimation of image data before performing any other real time single processing is specifically advantageous if the imaging device has more than one million pixels. This particular problem is discussed beginning at line 7 of the specification of the present invention, but not discussed by Tanaka et al. In Tanaka's invention, the same image processing between elements 20 and 23 are performed in both of two operational modes. There is no

teaching of using the decimation processing only in one of these modes. This is because whatever processing is performed must be performed to all data in order to display the data.

Therefore, according to the claimed invention, the decimation feature allows the user to view an image in real time (such as a moving image) in the first operational mode, even if a high resolution imaging device is utilized.

Because the reference relied upon by the Examiner fails to depict the limitations as currently claimed in claim 1, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

Applicants further submit that claims 2 and 3, and newly presented claims 5 and 6 depend from independent claim 1, and are therefore allowable for this reason alone, and additionally as presenting independently patentable combinations in and of their own right. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn. Furthermore, Applicants submit that it would be improper to reject claims 5 and 6 on these grounds.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place claims 1-3 and 5-6 in condition for allowance, and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner is unable to issue a Notice of Allowance regarding these claims, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney in order to discuss any further outstanding issues.

Early and favorable consideration are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By:



William S. Frommer

Reg. No. 25,506

(212) 588-0800